

REMARKS:Information Disclosure Statement

The Office Action indicated that the Information Disclosure Statement filed Aug. 30, 2001, was non-compliant because no translation was provided for DE 694 25 658. Applicant notes that this German reference corresponds to U.S. Patent No. 5,963,962. The two references share substantially the same disclosure. The '962 patent was cited in the Information Disclosure Statement. Accordingly, Applicant has decided not to resubmit the German document because the substance of the corresponding US patent has already been considered by the Examiner.

Status

After this response, claims 1 to 23 are pending. All pending claims have been amended. Claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 20, 22 and 23 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Initially, Applicants acknowledge the indication that claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 22 and 23 recite allowable subject matter. The Office Action stated the following in this regard:

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the Prior Art cited taken alone or in combination with other fails to teach or suggest (a) resolving conflicts when said information assigns two inconsistent values to a single variable by determining a higher priority source and a lower priority source and (b) defining a relative priority for a

first and a second information server in response to a relative position of the first and second information server in a sequence of locations.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11 and 15 to recite a feature along the lines of the first of these features, namely resolving conflicts when said information assigns two inconsistent values to a single variable by determining a higher priority source and a lower priority source.

Claims 19 and 22, which recited a feature along the lines of the second of these features, have been amended into independent form including all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims.

Claims 20 and 23 also have been amended into independent form including all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. While the Office Action indicated that these claims recited allowable subject matter, the Office Action did not go on to discuss the features of these claims in the given reasons for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reaffirm that these claims in fact do recite allowable subject matter.

In view of the foregoing, all claims are now believed to recite allowable subject matter.

Section 102 Rejection

Claims 1 to 8, 11 to 18, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent Number 6,757,723 (O'Toole). In view of Applicants' amendment of the independent claims

to recite subject matter that the Office Action indicated was allowable, this rejection is now believed to be moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested

Section 112 Rejection

Claims 4 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, for use of the term “substantially” in the claims. This term has been deleted from claims 4 and 17, as well as from claim 14. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

Amendments to Specification

The specification has been amended by adding paragraphs that recite language that substantially tracks the language of claims 9, 10, 22 and 23 prior to this response. At least because the claims as originally filed form part of the disclosure, no new matter has been added by these amendments.

Amendments to Preambles

The preambles of some of the claims have been amended for reasons related to style, not patentability. No change in the scopes of the claims is effected by these amendments.

Closing

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at (614) 486-3585. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dane C. Butzer
Reg. No. 43,521

Dated: May 5, 2005

Swernofsky Law Group PC
P.O. Box 390013
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013
(650) 947-0700